

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 4-11 are presently pending and stand rejected.

Claims 4, 6-8, 10, and 11 were rejected for double-patenting. Assignee presents terminal disclaimers to overcome this rejection.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Hook. Claim 4 recites, among other limitations, "the memory request arbiter performs real time scheduling of memory requests from different devices having different priorities...".

Examiner has indicated that Van Hook teaches "a memory request arbiter (memory controller/interface registers, figure 37, column 61, lines 32-53) coupled to the memory(allows for memory allocation between the two processors, column 61, lines 32-53 and column 14, lines 50-63), wherein the memory request arbiter performs real time scheduling of memory requests from different devices having different priorities".

Assignee respectfully submits that figure 37, and column 61, lines 32-53 do not even mention "different devices having different priorities" and accordingly, traverse the rejection to claim 4, as well as to dependent claims 5-11.

Claim 6 is now amended to recite, among other limitations "wherein said predetermined minimum interval is long enough for another device to access". Examiner has indicated that Van Hook teaches "a predetermined minimum interval between subsequent accesses by a device is enforced (subsequent access are delayed by a predetermined pipeline delay between processes, column 37, lines 7-30)." It is respectfully submitted that "wherein said

predetermined minimum interval is long enough for another device to access" does not read on the "delayed by a predetermined pipeline delay between processes". Accordingly, Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection to claim 6.

Claim 9 recites, among other limitations, "make high priority service requests through the circuit component." Claim 10 recites, among other limitations, "further comprising a round robin server for handling low priority tasks.

Examiner has made reference to Van Hook, DMA request from 210, Figure 6A to reject claim 9, and DMA requests from 208, figure 6a to reject claim 10. In Van Hook, reference 208 corresponds to "Audio Interface" while 210 corresponds to "Video Interface". There is no teaching that the "DMA request from 210" has any higher priority relative to "DMA request from 208", or that "DMA request from 208" has any lower priority relative to "DMA request from 210". Moreover, with respect to claim 10, Assignee respectfully traverses that "DMA requests from 208" are "a round robin server". Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejections to claims 9 and 10.

## **CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee submits that each of the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

It is believed that all monies for the actions described herein are provided with this correspondence. To the extent that additional monies are required for any of the actions requested in the correspondence, Commissioner

is authorized to charge such fees and credit any overpayments to deposit account 13-0017.

Respectfully Submitted



Mirut Dalal  
Attorney for Assignee  
Reg. No. 44,052

April 7, 2008

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison - Suite 3400  
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000  
FAX (312) 775-8100